Dear Howard, 3/11/78

I've just come in from what has been an endless battle against the ice. I've enjoyed it because I've been able to do so much of it. I don t think you can imagine what it has been, the entire lane full of the hardest and clingingest ice 6-8 inches thick. With snow still left on top of some places. It dies tire me, more after I stop than when I'm chopping, breaking and shovelling. When I stop I sit and rest. And think.

Sometimes I think of what I can do during the time I'll be resting, before I go out to continue the task. When the weather has permitted my staying with it after a rest I've done light inside work on the break, not somethinb on which I have to concentrate. But this time I was just sitting and thinling and resting. My thoughts turned to you and your call the other night.

I did not think long before I decided to write you.

The reason is that I believe you have not thought your plans through.

While I was disappointed at your decision I did not argue with you. You will recall that I suggested how you might better accomplish what you say you would like to do.

I did not think your plan through then. But it just occured to me that you have more thinking to do.

As I understood your reasoning it was that you need more experience in the law before you enter the practise of it. Perhaps ypu also added that it would not be fair to others if you did not do this. Thus you were going to apply to the two judiciary committees.

What I think you should ponder is what experience you'll get there that will help you prepare for any kind of practise. Even if you decide to specialize in practise that requires knowledge of the Congress, a speciality I doubt you'll opt.

I see nothing of the nature you seek. I would see it if you said some experience in a large firm, although you'd have to spend some time there before you'd be allowed the one experience I believe would be helpful - trial.

You may know something I do not know. Or see. Or visualize. But based on what I do know I do net see your obtaining what I understood you to be saying you seek.

If when you think this through you agree with me then I think you should be interested in why you decided to do what will not accomplish for you what I understood you to be saying you want to get out of working for a judiciary committee. This is to say inquire into your own reasoning and look for what could have led you to see what is not there. If you want me to carry this farthur tell me.

I'm not trying to talk you into anything or out of anything. Rathe · am I asking you to ask yourself. I see you performing on this at much lower than your level. As in not thinking of using a politcal approach when it is available.

Perhaps when you are in Washington you should discuss this with Jim.

Under any circumstances I believe you should go ahead and apply. But when you do I urge you to ask what the duties would be for a year or so.

On this I believe you might also ask Bud, who has spent enough time on the Hill.

Best,